

### **Remarks/Arguments**

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Claims 54, 70 and 75 have been amended in view of the one or more rejections of the claims and/or to better describe the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 60 and 79 have been amended to address minor informalities. Claims 66-67 have been amended to be consistent with amended Claim 54. Claims 68-69 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New Claims 80-81 have been added.

Claims 54, 59-69 and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirements. In response, the Applicants have amended Claim 54 and canceled Claim 68 to remove the language of concern from the claims. The Applicants have also reviewed the other claims of the application to ensure that none of the pending claims utilize language failing to meet the standards of the first paragraph of Section 112. Finally, the undersigned would like to apologize to the Examiner for unintentionally utilizing negative and/or implied recitations of functionality in the claims. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 54, 59-67 and 79 under the first paragraph of Section 112.

Claims 54 and 59-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Patent Publication GB 2 325 548 to Nabavi. In response, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and instead submit that Claims 54, 59-67 and 70-79, as above amended, as well as newly added Claims 80-81 are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 54 and 59-79 and the allowance of Claims 54, 59-67 and 70-81.

The cited art has been carefully considered but neither teaches nor suggests Applicants' invention as described and claimed herein. More specifically, Applicants' invention is directed to an interface for a security system comprised of first, second and third subsystems—the first subsystem managing the monitoring of a premises, the second subsystem displaying, at a first remote location, information collected by the first subsystem while managing the monitoring of the premises and the third subsystem performing, at a second remote location, lifestyle monitoring of the premises. Uniquely, while the interface does serve to couple both the second and third subsystems to the first subsystem so that information, collected at the first subsystem can be transmitted to the second subsystem for display and transmitted to the third subsystem for lifestyle monitoring purposes, not all of the information need be transmitted through the interface itself. Instead, information destined for the third subsystem is transmitted directly to the third subsystem, thereto, thereby eliminating any need for the interface itself to handle information to be used in lifestyle monitoring functions. By routing such information around the interface, the possibility of a bottlenecks occurring at the interface as a result of heavy data traffic is reduced. Further, by avoiding the interface, the possibility that lifestyle monitoring information would be inadvertently transmitted to the second subsystem and displayed is eliminated.

While information to be transmitted from the first subsystem to the third subsystem is not routed through the interface, the interface still functions as a three-way interface because, absent an exchange of data between the interface and the third subsystem—more specifically, the transmission of authentication information from the third subsystem to the interface and the transmission of access information from the interface to the third subsystem—the third subsystem would be unable to access the first subsystem. Thus, in spite of the route used for data transmissions between the first and third subsystems, the interface still acts to couple the first,

second and third subsystems, in that absent the interface, neither the second subsystem nor the third subsystem would be able to access the first subsystem.

In contrast, Nabavi is directed to a conventional system in which remote web browser 9 is only capable of accessing alarm controller 1 through the central computer 10. Access, by the remote web browser 9 through any route other than the central computer 10 is neither taught nor suggested by Nabavi. Indeed, even if one extends the teachings of Nabavi to encompass a teaching of a second remote web browser as part of the disclosed system, such a modification would result in a system in which both remote web browsers are coupled to the alarm controller 1 through the central computer 10.

It is noted that page 8, lines 5-6 indicates that Nabavi contemplates that “it is still possible in other embodiments for the remote web terminal to access the controller 1, directly from the Internet.” However, it is clear from a careful reading of Nabavi that the foregoing passage contemplates an embodiment where the functionality of the central monitoring station 8 would be eliminated or moved into either the alarm controller 1 or the remote web browser 9. It is further noted that various references cited by the Examiner in one or more related cases appear to teach the use of tokens for enabling remote access of a device. For example, U.S. 6,161,182 to Nadooshan discloses a token generating server 300 which provides tokens to a client 400 seeking to directly access remote equipment 140. However, nowhere does Nadooshan teach or suggest a system in which, in addition to providing tokens to the client 400, a discrete client would be able to access the remote equipment 140 through the token generating server 300 itself.


For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 54, 59-67 and 70-81 are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 54 and 59-79 and the allowance of Claims 54, 59-67 and 70-81.

It is believed that, apart from the 1-month extension of time fee enclosed herewith, no fees are due in connection with this Communication. However, in the event that additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any such fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 50-1515, Conley Rose, P.C.

This application is now in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice to that effect is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: MARCH 8, 2006

  
Michael S. Bush  
Reg. No. 31,745  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Conley Rose, P.C.  
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330  
Plano, Texas 75024  
(972) 731-2288 (Telephone)  
(972) 731-2289 (Facsimile)